

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Daniel E. Hall, Plaintiff,  
v.  
Twitter Inc., Defendant.

**Case No. 1:20-cv-536-SE**

**PLAINTIFF'S RULE 60(b) MOTION TO VOID JUDGMENTS**

1. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), Plaintiff, Daniel E. "Hall" motions to void the Court's "11/23/2022 Order" [1] denying Hall's request to recuse Judge Elliot, the "D. 124 Order" [2] which dismisses several of Hall's motions, and the "D. 139 Order" [3] dismissing all of Hall's three claims, on the grounds that Judge Elliot was disqualified under § 455 at the time she entered each of these orders and judgment in favor of Twitter. See *Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 850-51 (1988).

2. Having filed a motion for consideration (See Plaintiff's Rule 59(e) motion demonstrates strong evidence the Court misinterpreted Hall's Complaint or otherwise misapplied the facts to the law, vacating the judgment will not be an empty exercise." *Bouret–Echevarria*, 784 F.3d at 46 (quoting *Superline*, 953 F.2d at 20). Twitter will not suffer any prejudice from the restoration of the complaint, which this court had erroneously and prematurely dismissed. See *id.*

---

[1] 11/23/2023, Order denying Hall's Motion to Recuse at [D. 104].

[2] 11/30/2023, Order [D. 124] denying Motions to Strike [D. 100], for Default [D. 101], for Default Judgment [D. 102], and granting of defendants motion to renew. [D. 99].

[3] 05/09/2023 Order [D. 139], granting Twitter's Motion to Dismiss. [D. 3].

Recusal-

Judge Elliot was aware of the material facts of Hall's complaints concerning Magistrate Johnstone's illegal policy through her administrative position. This influenced her decision, and even if it did not, judges have an obligation to maintain an appearance of impartiality that goes beyond mere actual impartiality. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), the final judgment should be vacated as it is just to do so in circumstances such as these. See (Recusal- Plaintiff's Rule 59 Motion).

Because Judge Elliot was disqualified under § 455 at the time she entered each of these orders and judgment in favor of Twitter, they should be set aside. See *Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 850-51 (1988).

Respectfully,

/s/ Daniel E. Hall

Aka, Sensa Verogna

SensaVerogna@gmail.com

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Daniel E. Hall, certify that on June 7, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing document using the CM/ECF system, which sent notification of such filing to the Defendants counsel of record, Kenneth M. Trujillo-Jamison at [ktrujillo-jamison@willenken.com](mailto:ktrujillo-jamison@willenken.com) and Demetrio F. Aspiras at [daspiras@dwmlaw.com](mailto:daspiras@dwmlaw.com), and Indraneel Sur, Lead Attorney for U.S. DOJ.

/s/Daniel E. Hall

Plaintiff